

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/689,672
Docket No.: 17950-US-PA

REMARKS

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to include the feature provided in claim 7 and cancel claim 7. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims 1-6 and 8-12 are respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamasaki et al. EP 1093167 A2 (hereinafter Yamasaki) and rejected claims 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki in views of Bernard et al. US 2002/0022283 (hereinafter Bernard) or Yamane et al. US 5,059,266 (hereinafter Yamane).

In response to the rejection to claims 1-12, Applicant amends independent claim 1 and respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that neither the ink jet printing device as set forth in amended claims 1-6 and 8-12 are taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Yamasaki or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Specifically, Applicant submits that the pressure adjusting unit comprises a pump and a controller, the controller controlling the pump to inject gas to or to exhaust gas from the chamber, and the amount of the injected gas or the exhausted gas in amended claim 1. However, Yamasaki and Yamane fail to teach or suggest a controller controlling the pump to inject gas to or to exhaust gas from the chamber, and the amount of the injected gas or the exhausted gas.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/689,672
Docket No.: 17950-US-PA

Meanwhile, Bernard only discloses the controller 6 for controlling the secondary pump 2 and the primary pump 3 to exhaust gas from the process chamber 1. That is, Bernard also fails to teach, or suggest a controller controlling the pump to inject gas to the chamber, and the amount of the injected gas. Accordingly, the present invention as set forth in amended claim 1 should not be considered as being anticipated by Yamasaki or as being unpatentable over Yamasaki in views of Bernard and Yamane, and amended claim 1 should be allowable.

For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 8-12 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these dependent claims contain all features of the independent claim 1.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/689,672
Docket No.: 17950-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-6 and 8-12 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

May 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw